arXiv:1301.6208v1 [math.NT] 26 Jan 2013

ADDITIVE SYSTEMS AND A THEOREM OF DE BRUIJN

MELVYN B. NATHANSON

In memoriam Nicolaas Govert de Bruijn

Abstract. This paper gives a complete proof of a theorem of de Bruijn that classifies additive systems for the nonnegative integers, that is, families $\mathcal{A} = (A_i)_{i \in I}$ of sets of nonnegative integers, each set containing 0, such that every nonnegative integer can be written uniquely in the form $\sum_{i \in I} a_i$ with $a_i \in A_i$ for all i and $a_i \neq 0$ for only finitely many i. All indecomposable additive systems are determined.

1. Additive systems

Let $\mathbf{N}$, $\mathbf{N}_0$, and $\mathbf{Z}$ denote the sets of positive integers, nonnegative integers, and all integers, respectively. For integers a and b with $a < b$, we define the *intervals of integers*

$$[a,b] = \{n \in \mathbf{Z} : a \leq n \leq b\}$$

and

$$[a,b) = \{n \in \mathbf{Z} : a \leq n < b\}.$$

Let I be a nonempty finite or infinite set, and let $\mathcal{A} = (A_i)_{i \in I}$ be a family of sets of integers with $0 \in A_i$ and $|A_i| \geq 2$ for all $i \in I$. We may also call $\mathcal{A}$ a *sequence* if $I = \mathbf{N}$ or if I is an interval of integers. Each set A_i can be finite or infinite. We say that a set X *belongs to* $\mathcal{A}$ if $X = A_i$ for some $i \in I$. The *sumset* $S = \sum_{i \in I} A_i$ is the set of all integers n that can be represented in the form $n = \sum_{i \in I} a_i$, where $a_i \in A_i$ for all $i \in I$ and $a_i \neq 0$ for only finitely many $i \in I$. If every element of S has a *unique* representation in the form $n = \sum_{i \in I} a_i$, then we call $\mathcal{A}$ a *unique representation system for* S, and we write

$$S = \bigoplus_{i \in I} A_i.$$

If $\mathcal{A}$ is a unique representation system for S, then $A_i \cap A_j = \{0\}$ for all $i \neq j$. The condition $|A_i| \geq 2$ for all $i \in I$ implies that $A_i = S$ for some $i \in I$ if and only if $|I| = 1$. Moreover, if $I^\flat \subseteq I$ and $S = \sum_{i \in I^\flat} A_i$, then $S = \bigoplus_{i \in I^\flat} A_i$ and $I = I^\flat$.

The family $\mathcal{A} = (A_i)_{i \in I}$ is an *additive system* if $\mathcal{A}$ is a unique representation system for the set of nonnegative integers. Equivalently, $\mathcal{A}$ is an additive system if $\mathbf{N}_0 = \bigoplus_{i \in I} A_i$.

Date: January 29, 2013.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 11A05, 11B75.

Key words and phrases. Additive system, indecomposable additive system, additive basis, British number system.

Supported in part by a grant from the PSC-CUNY Research Award Program.

The object of this paper is to prove a beautiful theorem of deBruijn in additive number theory that completely classifies additive systems. The only number theory used in the proof is the division algorithm.

Theorem 1 (Division algorithm)**.** *Let g be a positive integer. For every integer n there exist unique integers x and r with $r \in [0,g)$ such that $n = gx + r$.*

Proof. Consider the set

$$R^+ = \{n - gx : x \in \mathbf{Z}\} \cap \mathbf{N}_0.$$

Because R^+ is a nonempty set of nonnegative integers, the minimum principle ("every nonempty set of nonnegative integers contains a smallest element"), implies that there exists $x \in \mathbf{Z}$ such that

$$r = n - gx = \min(R^+).$$

If $r \geq g$, then

$$0 \leq r - g = n - g(x+1) < r$$

and

$$r - g \in R^+.$$

These statements contradict the minimality of r, and so there exist $x \in \mathbf{Z}$ and $r \in [0,g)$ such that $n = gx + r$. Note that if $r, r' \in [0,g)$, then $|r - r'| \leq g - 1 < g$. If $x' \in \mathbf{Z}$ and $r' \in [0,g)$ also satisfy $n = gx' + r'$, then

$$g(x' - x) = r - r'.$$

If $x \neq x'$, then $|x' - x| \geq 1$ and

$$g \leq g|x' - x| = |r - r'| < g$$

which is absurd. Therefore, $x = x'$ and $r = r'$. This proves the division algorithm. □

2. Examples of additive systems

Notation: For $A \subseteq \mathbf{Z}$ and $g \in \mathbf{Z}$, the *dilation* of the set A by g is the set $g * A = \{ga : a \in A\}$. If $g_1, g_2 \in \mathbf{Z}$, then

$$g_1 * (g_2 * A) = (g_1 g_2) * A = (g_2 g_1) * A = g_2 * (g_1 * A).$$

Example 1: For $g \geq 2$, let

$$A_1 = \{0, 1, 2, \ldots, g-1\} = [0, g)$$

and

$$A_2 = \{0, g, 2g, 3g, 4g, \ldots\} = g * \mathbf{N}_0.$$

The division algorithm implies that $\mathcal{A} = \{A_1, A_2\}$ is an additive system. More generally, let $\mathcal{A} = (A_i)_{i \in I}$ be an additive system. Let $I_1 = I \cup \{i_1\}$, where $i_1 \notin I$, and define the sets $A'_{i_1} = [0, g)$ and $A'_i = g * A_i$ for all $i \in I$. Again, the division algorithm implies that $\mathcal{A}' = (A'_i)_{i \in I_1}$ is an additive system. We call $\mathcal{A}'$ the *dilation of the additive system $\mathcal{A}$ by the integer g*, and we write $\mathcal{A}' = g * \mathcal{A}$.

Example 2: Let

$$\begin{aligned} B_1 &= \{0, 1, 2, 3, \ldots, 11\} = [0, 12) \\ B_2 &= \{0, 12, 24, 36, \ldots, 228\} = 12 * [0, 20) \\ B_3 &= \{0, 240, 480, 720, 960, \ldots\} = 240 * \mathbf{N}_0. \end{aligned}$$

Applying Theorem 1 with $r = 2$, $g_1 = 12$ and $g_2 = 20$, we see that $\mathcal{B} = (B_1)_{i=1}^3$ is an additive system. For example,

$$835 = 7 + 108 + 720 = 1 \cdot 7 + 12 \cdot 9 + 240 \cdot 3 \in B_1 + B_2 + B_3.$$

In pre-1971 British currency, there were 20 shillings in a pound and 12 pence (or pennies) in a shilling, hence 240 pence in a pound. Thus, 835 pence were equal to 3 pounds, 9 shillings, and 7 pence. The additive system $\mathcal{B}$ is the old *British monetary system.*

Example 3: For $i = 1, 2, 3, \ldots$, let

$$B_i = \{0, 2^{i-1}\} = 2^{i-1} * [0, 2).$$

Because every nonnegative integer can be written uniquely as a finite sum of pairwise distinct powers of 2, the family $\mathcal{B} = (B_i)_{i \in \mathbf{N}}$ is an additive system, called the *binary number system.*

Let $\mathcal{C} = \{C_i\}_{i \in \mathbf{N}}$, where

$$C_i = \{0, 10^{i-1}, 2 \cdot 10^{i-1}, 3 \cdot 10^{i-1}, \ldots, 9 \cdot 10^{i-1}\} = 10^{i-1} * [0, 10).$$

The additive system $\mathcal{C}$ is the ordinary decimal system, which deBruijn called the *Continental number system.*

More generally, for any integer $g \geq 2$, let

$$D_i = g^{i-1} * [0, g)$$

for $i = 1, 2, 3, \ldots$. The additive system $\mathcal{D} = \{D_i\}_{i \in \mathbf{N}}$ is the *g-adic number system.*

Example 4: We need the following result, which uses only the division algorithm.

Theorem 2. *Let $r \in \mathbf{N}$ and let $(g_i)_{i \in [1,r]}$ be a finite family of not necessarily distinct integers such that $g_i \geq 2$ for all $i \in [1, r]$. Let $G_0 = 1$ and $G_j = \prod_{i=1}^j g_i$ for $j \in [1, r]$. Every integer n has a unique representation in the form $n = \sum_{i=1}^{r+1} G_{i-1} x_i$ with $x_i \in [0, g_i)$ for $i \in [1, r]$ and $x_{r+1} \in \mathbf{Z}$. Moreover, $n \in \mathbf{N}_0$ if and only if $x_{r+1} \geq 0$, and $n \in [0, G_r)$ if and only if $x_{r+1} = 0$.*

Proof. We shall prove the Theorem by induction on r. Let $n \in \mathbf{Z}$. Applying the division algorithm with $g = g_1 = G_1$, we obtain unique integers $x_1 \in [0, g_1)$ and x_2 such that $n = g_1 x_2 + x_1 = \sum_{i=1}^2 G_{i-1} x_i$. If $x_2 < 0$, then $x < 0$. Equivalently, $n \in \mathbf{N}_0$ if and only if $x_2 \geq 0$. Similarly, $n \in [0, g_1)$ if and only if $x_2 = 0$.

Let $r \geq 2$ and assume the Theorem holds for $r - 1$. For every $n \in \mathbf{Z}$ there are unique integers $x_1, \ldots, x_{r-1}, x'_r$ with $x_i \in [0, g_i)$ for $i \in [1, r-1)$ such that

$$n = \sum_{i=1}^{r-1} G_{i-1} x_i + G_{r-1} x'_r.$$

Applying the division algorithm to x'_r, we obtain unique integers $x_r \in [0, g_r)$ and x_{r+1} such that

$$\begin{aligned} n &= \sum_{i=1}^{r-1} G_{i-1}x_i + G_{r-1}(x_r + g_r x_{r+1}) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{r} G_{i-1}x_i + G_{r-1}g_r x_{r+1} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{r+1} G_{i-1}x_i. \end{aligned}$$

The inequality

$$0 \leq \sum_{i=1}^{r+1} G_{i-1}x_i \leq \sum_{i=1}^{r+1} G_{i-1}(g_i - 1) = \sum_{i=1}^{r+1} G_i - \sum_{i=1}^{r+1} G_{i-1} = G_{r+1} - 1$$

implies that $n \geq 0$ if and only if $x_{r+1} \geq 0$ and $n \in [0, G_r)$ if and only if $x_{r+1} = 0$. This completes the proof. □

Corollary 1. *Let $r \in \mathbf{N}$ and let $(g_i)_{i\in[1,r]}$ be a finite family of not necessarily distinct integers such that $g_i \geq 2$ for all $i \in [1, r]$. Let $G_0 = 1$ and $G_i = \prod_{j=1}^{i} g_j$ for $i \in [1, r]$. Then*

$$[0, G_r) = \bigoplus_{i\in[1,r]} G_{i-1} * [0, g_i)$$

and

$$\mathbf{N}_0 = \bigoplus_{i\in[1,r]} G_{i-1} * [0, g_i) \oplus G_r * \mathbf{N}_0.$$

Thus, the family $(G_{i-1} * [0, g_i))_{i\in[1,r]}$ is a unique representation system for the interval $[0, G_r)$, and this family together with the set $G_r * \mathbf{N}_0$ is an additive system.

3. Dilation, contraction, and decomposition

In this section we describe three operations on additive systems that produce new additive systems.

Let $\mathcal{A} = (A_i)_{i\in I}$ be an additive system, Without loss of generality, and for simplicity of notation, we shall assume that $I \cap \mathbf{N} = \emptyset$.

In Example 1 we described the dilation of the additive system by an integer $g \geq 2$. We define *dilation by a finite family* $(g_i)_{i\in[1,r]}$ of integers $g_i \geq 2$ by iterated dilation by integers:

$$\begin{aligned} (g_i)_{i\in[1,r]} * \mathcal{A} &= g_1 * (g_2 * (\cdots * (g_{r-1} * (g_r * \mathcal{A})) \cdots)) \\ &= (A'_i)_{i\in[1,r]\cup I} \end{aligned}$$

where

$$A'_i = \begin{cases} G_{i-1} * [0, g_i) & \text{if } i \in [1, r] \\ g * A_i & \text{if } i \in I. \end{cases}$$

and $G_0 = 1$ and $G_i = \prod_{j\in[1,i]} g_j$ for $i \in [1, r]$.

Note that dilation of additive systems by finite families of integers is not commutative. For example, if $g_1, g_2 \in \mathbf{Z}$ and $2 \leq g_1 < g_2$, then $g_1 * (g_2 * \mathcal{A})$ consists of $(g_1 g_2 * A_i)_{i\in I}$ and the sets $[0, g_1)$ and $g_1 * [0, g_2)$, while $g_2 * (g_1 * \mathcal{A})$ consists of the sets $(g_1g_2 * A_i)_{i\in I}$ and the sets $[0, g_2)$ and $g_2 * [0, g_1)$. Because $[0, g_1) \neq [0, g_2)$, it follows that $(g_i)_{i\in[1,2]} * \mathcal{A} \neq (g_{3-i})_{i\in[1,2]} * \mathcal{A}$.

The following Lemma shows that the dilation of a dilation is a dilation, or that, equivalently, dilation is associative.

Lemma 1. *Let $\mathcal{A}$, $\mathcal{B}$, and $\mathcal{C}$ be additive systems. If the additive system $\mathcal{A}$ is a dilation of the additive system $\mathcal{B}$ by the finite sequence $(g_i)_{i\in[1,r]}$, and if $\mathcal{B}$ is a dilation of the additive system $\mathcal{C}$ by the finite sequence $(g'_j)_{j\in[1,s]}$, then $\mathcal{A}$ is a dilation of the additive system $\mathcal{C}$ dilated by $(g_i)_{i\in[1,r+s]}$, where $g_{r+j} = g'_j$ for $j \in [1, s]$.*

Proof. This follows immediately from the definition of dilation. □

Partitioning an index set gives a second method to produce additive systems.

Theorem 3. *Let $\mathcal{B} = (B_j)_{j\in J}$ be an additive system. If $\{J_i\}_{i\in I}$ is a partition of J into pairwise disjoint nonempty sets, and if*

$$A_i = \sum_{j\in J_i} B_j$$

then $\mathcal{A} = (A_i)_{i\in I}$ is an additive system.

Proof. This is an immediate consequence of the definition of an additive system. □

An additive system $\mathcal{A}$ obtained from an additive system $\mathcal{B}$ by the partition procedure described in Theorem 3 is called a *contraction* of $\mathcal{B}$. (In [4], de Bruijn called $\mathcal{A}$ a *degeneration* of $\mathcal{B}$.) The set I in Theorem 3 can be finite or infinite. If $I = J$ and σ is a permutation of J such that $J_i = \{\sigma(i)\}$ for all $i \in J$, then $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ contain exactly the same sets. Thus, every additive system is a contraction of itself. An additive system $\mathcal{A}$ is a *proper contraction* of $\mathcal{B}$ if at least one set $A_i \in \mathcal{A}$ is the sum of at least two sets in $\mathcal{B}$.

If $I = \{1\}$ and $J_1 = J$, then $A_1 = \mathbf{N}_0$. Thus, the additive system $(\mathbf{N}_0)$ is a contraction of every additive system.

The following Lemma shows that the contraction of a contraction is a contraction:

Lemma 2. *If $\mathcal{A} = (A_i)_{i\in I}$, $\mathcal{B} = (B_j)_{j\in J}$, and $\mathcal{C} = (C_k)_{k\in K}$ are additive systems such that $\mathcal{A}$ is a contraction of $\mathcal{B}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ is a contraction of $\mathcal{C}$, then $\mathcal{A}$ is a contraction of $\mathcal{C}$.*

Proof. Because $\mathcal{A}$ is a contraction of $\mathcal{B}$, there exists a partition $\{J_i : i \in I\}$ of J such that $A_i = \sum_{j\in J_i} B_j$ for all $i \in I$. Because $\mathcal{B}$ is a contraction of $\mathcal{C}$, there exists a partition $\{K_j : j \in J\}$ of K such that $B_j = \sum_{k\in K_j} C_k$ for all $j \in J$. Then

$$A_i = \sum_{j\in J_i} B_j = \sum_{j\in J_i} \sum_{k\in K_j} C_k = \sum_{k\in L_i} C_k$$

where

$$L_i = \bigcup_{j\in J_i} K_j \subseteq K$$

and

$$\bigcup_{i\in I} L_i = \bigcup_{i\in I} \bigcup_{j\in J_i} K_j = \bigcup_{j\in J} K_j = K.$$

We shall show the sets in $\{L_i : i \in I\}$ are pairwise disjoint.

Let $k \in K$. If $i_1, i_2 \in I$ and $k \in L_{i_1} \cap L_{i_2}$, then $k \in K_{j_1}$ for some $j_1 \in J_{i_1}$ and $k \in K_{j_2}$ for some $j_2 \in J_{i_2}$. Because $\{K_j : j \in J\}$ is a set of pairwise disjoint sets and $K_{j_1} \cap K_{j_2} \neq \emptyset$, it follows that $j_1 = j_2$ and so $J_{i_1} \cap J_{i_2} \neq \emptyset$. Because $\{J_i : i \in I\}$ is a set of pairwise disjoint sets, it follows that $i_1 = i_2$, and so the sets in $\{L_i : i \in I\}$ are pairwise disjoint. Thus, $\{L_i : i \in I\}$ is a partition of I, and the additive system $\mathcal{A}$ is a contraction of $\mathcal{C}$. This completes the proof. □

Decomposition is a third method to produce new additive systems. The set A of integers is a *proper sumset* if there exist sets B and C of integers such that $|B| \geq 2$, $|C| \geq 2$, and $A = B + C$. For example, if u and v are integers and $v - u \geq 3$, then the interval $[u, v)$ is a proper sumset:

$$[u, v) = [0, i) + [u, v + 1 - i)$$

for every $i \in [2, v - u)$.

The set A of integers is *decomposable* if there exist sets B and C such that $|B| \geq 2$, $|C| \geq 2$, and $A = B \oplus C$. If $A = B \oplus C$, then $g * A = g * B \oplus g * C$, and so every dilation of a decomposable set is decomposable.

An *indecomposable set* is a set that does not decompose. If A is a decomposable set and $A = B \oplus C$, then $|A| = |B||C|$ with $\min(|B|, |C|) \geq 2$, and so $|A|$ is a composite integer. Thus, a finite set whose cardinality is prime must be indecomposable. However, not every set with a composite number of elements is decomposable. For example, the n-element set $\{0, 1, 2, 2^2, \ldots, 2^{n-2}\}$ is indecomposable for every $n \geq 2$.

Decompositions are not necessarily unique. For example, if the integer n is composite, if $C = [0, n)$, and if d is any divisor of n such that $1 < d < n$, then $A \oplus B = C$ for $A = [0, d)$ and $B = d * [0, n/d)$. Thus, $[0, 6) = \{0, 1\} \oplus \{0, 2, 4\} = \{0, 1, 2\} \oplus \{0, 3\}$. The interval $[0, n)$ has a unique decomposition if and only if n is the square of a prime number.

An additive system $\mathcal{A} = (A_i)_{i \in I}$ is called *decomposable* if the set A_{i_0} is decomposable for some $i_0 \in I$, and *indecomposable* if A_i is indecomposable for all $i \in I$. If $\mathcal{A}$ is a decomposable additive system and if A_{i_0} is a decomposable set in $\mathcal{A}$, then there exist sets of integers B and C such that $|B| \geq 2$, $|C| \geq 2$, and $A_{i_0} = B + C$. Translating B and C if necessary, we can assume that $0 \in B \cap C$. We define the additive system $\mathcal{A}' = (A'_i)_{i \in [1,2] \cup I \setminus \{i_0\}}$ as follows:

$$A'_i = \begin{cases} A_i & \text{if } i \in I \setminus \{i_0\} \\ B & \text{if } i = 1 \\ C & \text{if } i = 2. \end{cases}$$

We call the additive system $\mathcal{A}'$ a *decomposition* of the additive system $\mathcal{A}$.

4. BRITISH NUMBER SYSTEMS

In this section we describe certain additive systems that de Bruijn called *British number systems*. A *British number system* is an additive system constructed from an infinite sequence of integers according to the algorithm in the following theorem.

Theorem 4. *Let $(g_i)_{i \in \mathbf{N}}$ be an infinite sequence of integers such that $g_i \geq 2$ for all $i \geq 1$. Let $G_0 = 1$ and, for $i \in \mathbf{N}$, let $G_i = \prod_{j=1}^{i} g_j$ and*

$$A_i = \{0, G_{i-1}, 2G_{i-1}, \ldots, (g_i - 1)G_{i-1}\} = G_{i-1} * [0, g_i). \tag{1}$$

Then $\mathcal{A} = (A_i)_{i \in \mathbf{N}}$ is an additive system.

Proof. If $n \in \mathbf{N}_0$, then $n \in [0, G_r)$ for some sufficiently large integer r. By Corollary 1, there exist unique integers $a_i \in A_i$ for $i = 1, \ldots, r$ such that $n = \sum_{i=1}^r a_i \in \bigoplus_{i=1}^r A_i$. Because $a \geq G_r$ for all $a \in \left(\bigcup_{i \in \mathbf{N} \setminus [1,r]} A_i\right) \setminus \{0\}$, it follows that n has a unique representation in the form $\sum_{i \in \mathbf{N}} a_i$ with $a_i \in A_i$ for all $i \in \mathbf{N}$, and so $\mathcal{A} = (A_i)_{i \in \mathbf{N}}$ is an additive system. □

We write that the sequence $(g_i)_{i \in \mathbf{N}}$ *generates* the British number system $\mathcal{A}$ if $\mathcal{A}$ is constructed from $(g_i)_{i \in \mathbf{N}}$ according to the algorithm in Theorem 4.

Lemma 3. *If $(g_i)_{i \in \mathbf{N}}$ generates the British number system $\mathcal{A}$ and if $(g'_i)_{i \in \mathbf{N}}$ generates the British number system $\mathcal{A}'$, then $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}'$ if and only if $g_i = g'_i$ for all $i \in \mathbf{N}$.*

Proof. Suppose that $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}'$. If $g_i = g'_i$ for all $i < r$, then

$$G_r = \prod_{i \in [1, r-1]} g_i = \prod_{i \in [1, r-1]} g'_i = G'_r$$

and

$$G_{r-1} * [0, g_r) = A_r = A'_r = G'_{r-1} * [0, g'_r) = G_{r-1} * [0, g'_r)$$

and so $g_r = g'_r$. It follows by induction that $g_i = g'_i$ for all $i \in \mathbf{N}$. □

Thus, there is a one-to-one correspondence between British number systems and integer sequences $(g_i)_{i \in \mathbf{N}}$ satisfying $g_i \geq 2$ for all $i \in \mathbf{N}$.

de Bruijn's result is that *every* additive system is a contraction of a British number system. The proof depends on the following fundamental lemma.

Lemma 4. *Let $\mathcal{A} = (A_i)_{i \in I}$ be an additive system. If $|I| \geq 2$, then there exist $i_1 \in I$, an integer $g \geq 2$, and a family of sets $\mathcal{B} = (B_i)_{i \in I}$ such that*

$$A_{i_1} = [0, g) \oplus g * B_{i_1}$$

and, for all $i \in I \setminus \{i_1\}$,

$$A_i = g * B_i.$$

If $B_{i_1} = \{0\}$, then $\mathcal{B} = (B_i)_{i \in I \setminus \{i_1\}}$ is an additive system, and $\mathcal{A}$ is the dilation of the additive system $\mathcal{B}$ by the integer g. If $B_{i_1} \neq \{0\}$, then $\mathcal{B} = (B_i)_{i \in I}$ is an additive system and $\mathcal{A}$ is a contraction of the additive system $\mathcal{B}$ dilated by g.

Proof. The inequality $|I| \geq 2$ implies that $A_i \neq \mathbf{N}_0$ for all $i \in I$. Because $1 \in \sum_{i \in I} A_i$, it follows that $1 \in A_{i_1}$ for some $i_1 \in I$. Because $A_{i_1} \neq \mathbf{N}_0$, there is a smallest positive integer g such that $g \notin A_{i_1}$. Then $g \geq 2$ and $[0, g) \subseteq A_{i_1}$. The sets in the family $(A_i \setminus \{0\})_{i \in I}$ are pairwise disjoint, and so $\{1, \ldots, g-1\} \cap A_i = \emptyset$ for all $i \in I \setminus \{i_1\}$.

We have $g = \sum_{i \in I} a_i \in \sum_{i \in I} A_i$, with $0 \leq a_i \leq g$ for all $i \in I$. If $1 \leq a_{i_1} \leq g-1$, then there must exist $j \in I \setminus \{i_1\}$ such that $1 \leq a_j \leq g-1$, which is absurd. Therefore, $a_{i_2} = g$ for some $i_2 \in I \setminus \{i_1\}$ and $a_i = 0$ for all $i \in I \setminus \{i_2\}$.

Let $r \in \{1, 2, \ldots, g-1\}$. Then

$$r + g \in A_{i_1} + A_{i_2} \subseteq \sum_{i \in I} A_i.$$

Because the representation of an integer in $\sum_{i \in I} A_i$ is unique, it follows that $r + g \notin A_i$ for all $i \in I$.

We shall prove that for every nonnegative integer k the following holds:

(i) $[kg+1,(k+1)g) \cap \bigcup_{i\in I\setminus\{i_1\}} A_i = \emptyset$,

(ii) If $[kg,(k+1)g) \cap A_{i_1} \neq \emptyset$, then $[kg,(k+1)g) \subseteq A_{i_1}$.

The proof is by induction on k . Statements (i) and (ii) already been verified for $k=0$ and $k=1$. Let $k \geq 2$ and assume that statements (i) and (ii) are true for all nonnegative integers $k' < k$.

For each $i \in I$ there exists $a_i \in A_i$ such that $0 \leq a_i \leq kg$ and

$$kg = \sum_{i\in I} a_i = a_{i_1} + \sum_{i\in I\setminus\{i_1\}} a_i.$$

By the induction hypothesis, $k'g + r \notin \bigcup_{i\in I\setminus\{i_1\}} A_i$ for all $k' \in [0,k)$ and $r \in [1,g)$. Therefore, $a_i \equiv 0 \pmod{g}$ for all $i \in I \setminus \{i_1\}$, and so $a_{i_1} \equiv 0 \pmod{g}$.

There are two cases. In the first case we have $kg \notin A_{i_1}$, and so $a_{i_1} = k'g$ for some nonnegative integer $k' < k$. By the induction hypothesis, $a_{i_1} + r = k'g + r \in A_{i_1}$ for all $r \in [0, g-1)$, and so

$$kg + r = (a_{i_1} + r) + \sum_{i\in I\setminus\{i_1\}} a_i \in \sum_{i\in I} A_i.$$

Because the integer $kg+r$ has a unique representation in the sumset $\sum_{i\in I} A_i$, it follows that $kg + r \notin \bigcup_{i\in I} A_i$ for all $r \in [0, g-1)$.

In the second case we have $kg \in A_{i_1}$. Because $g \in A_{i_2}$, we have

$$(k+1)g = kg + g \in A_{i_1} + A_{i_2} \subseteq \sum_{i\in I} A_i.$$

Let $r \in \{1,2,\ldots,g-1\}$. Because $\{1,2,\ldots,g-1\} \subseteq A_{i_1}$, it follows that $g - r \in A_{i_1}$. If $kg + r \in A_{i_3}$ for some $r \in \{1,2,\ldots,g-1\}$ and $i_3 \neq i_1$, then

$$(k+1)g = (g-r) + (kg+r) \in A_{i_1} + A_{i_3} \subseteq \sum_{i\in I} A_i.$$

This gives two distinct representations of $(k+1)g$ in $\sum_{i\in I} A_i$, which is absurd. Therefore, $kg + r \notin A_i$ for all $i \in I \setminus \{i_1\}$. Thus, if $a_i \in A_i$ for $i \in I \setminus \{i_1\}$ and $a_i < (k+1)g$, then $a_i \equiv 0 \pmod{g}$. Writing

$$kg + r = a_{i_1} + \sum_{i\in I\setminus\{i_1\}} a_i \in \sum_{i\in I} A_i$$

we conclude that there exists a nonnegative integer $\ell \leq k$ such that

$$a_{i_1} = \ell g + r \in A_{i_1}$$

and

$$\sum_{i\in I\setminus\{i_1\}} a_i = (k-\ell)g$$

If $\ell < k$, then the induction hypothesis implies that $\ell g \in A_{i_1}$ and so

$$\ell g + \sum_{i\in I\setminus\{i_1\}} a_i = kg,$$

which is impossible since $kg \in A_{i_1}$. Therefore, $\ell = k$ and $kg + r \in A_{i_1}$ for all $r \in \{1,2,\ldots,g-1\}$. This completes the induction.

For each $i \in I$, let $B_i = \{k \in \mathbf{N}_0 : kg \in A_i\}$. Then

$$A_{i_1} = [0,g) \oplus g * B_{i_1} \tag{2}$$

and, for every $i \in I \setminus \{i_1\}$,

$$A_i = g * B_i.$$

Let $n \in N_0$. There is a unique sequence of integers $(b_i)_{i\in I}$ with $b_i \in B_i$ for all $i \in I$ such that

$$1 + gn = (1 + gb_{i_1}) + \sum_{i\in I\setminus\{i_1\}} gb_i \in \sum_{i\in I} A_1.$$

It follows that $n = \sum_{i\in I} b_i \in \sum_{i\in I} B_i$. If $B_{i_1} = \{0\}$, then $A_{i_1} = [0, g-1)$ and $\mathcal{B} = (b_i)_{i\in I\setminus\{i_1\}}$ is an additive system. Thus, $\mathcal{A}$ is the dilation of the additive system $\mathcal{B}$ by the integer g.

If $B_{i_1} \neq \{0\}$, then $\mathcal{B} = (b_i)_{i\in I}$ is an additive system and the decomposition (2) shows that $\mathcal{A}$ is a contraction of the additive system $\mathcal{B}$ dilated by the integer g. This completes the proof. □

If $\mathcal{A} = (A_i)_{i\in \mathbf{N}}$ is the British number system generated by the sequence $(g_i)_{i\in\mathbf{N}}$, then $A_1 = [0, g_1)$ and, for all $i \geq 2$,

$$A_i = g_1(g_2 \cdots g_{i-1}) * [0, g_i) = g_1 * B_i$$

where

$$B_i = g_2 \cdots g_{i-1} * [0, g_i).$$

Thus, $\mathcal{B} = (B_i)_{i\in\mathbf{N}\setminus\{1\}}$ is the British number system generated by the sequence $(g_i)_{i\in\mathbf{N}\setminus\{1\}}$, and $\mathcal{A}$ is the dilation of $\mathcal{B}$ by g_1.

Corollary 2. *Let a and b be positive integers, and let X be a set of integers. Then*

$$[0, ab) = [0, a) \oplus X$$

if and only if

$$X = a * [0, b).$$

Proof. The division algorithm implies that $[0, ab) = [0, a) \oplus a * [0, b)$, and so $X = a * [0, b)$ is a solution of the additive set equation $[0, a) \oplus X = [0, ab)$.

Conversely, let X is any solution of this equation. Let $I = [1, 3]$ and let $A_1 = [0, a)$, $A_2 = X$, and $A_3 = ab * N_0$. Again, the division algorithm implies that $\mathcal{A} = (A_i)_{i\in I}$ is an additive system. Applying Lemma 4 to $\mathcal{A}$, we obtain sets B_1, B_2, and B_3 such that

$$\begin{aligned} [0, a) &= [0, a) \oplus a * B_1 \\ X &= a * B_2 \\ ab * \mathbf{N}_0 &= a * B_3 \end{aligned}$$

and so $B_1 = \{0\}$, $B_3 = b * \mathbf{N}_0$, and $B_2 \oplus B_3 = \mathbf{N}_0$. It follows that $B_2 = [0, b)$. and $X = a * [0, b)$. This completes the proof. □

5. Classification of additive systems

Let $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ be additive systems, let $r \in \mathbf{N}$, and let $(g_i)_{i\in[1,r]}$ be a sequence of integers $g_i \geq 2$. The expression "$\mathcal{A}$ is a contraction of the additive system $\mathcal{B}$ dilated by $(g_i)_{i\in[1,r]}$" means that $\mathcal{A}$ is the additive system obtained by first dilating $\mathcal{B}$ by $(g_i)_{i\in[1,r]}$ and then contracting the dilated system.

To prove that a "dilation of a dilation" is a dilation (Lemma 1) or that a "contraction of a contraction is a contraction" (Lemma 2) is not hard. It is more challenging to prove that a "contraction of a dilation of a contraction of a dilation" is a contraction of a dilation.

Lemma 5. *Let $\mathcal{A}$, $\mathcal{B}$, and $\mathcal{C}$ be additive systems. If the additive system $\mathcal{A}$ is a contraction of the additive system $\mathcal{B}$ dilated by the finite sequence $(g_i)_{i\in[1,r]}$, and if $\mathcal{B}$ is a contraction of the additive system $\mathcal{C}$ dilated by the finite sequence $(g'_j)_{j\in[1,s]}$, then $\mathcal{A}$ is a contraction of the additive system $\mathcal{C}$ dilated by $(g_i)_{i\in[1,r+s]}$, where $g_{r+j} = g'_j$ for $j \in [1,s]$.*

Proof. As usual, for $k \in [1,s]$, we define $G'_k = \prod_{j=1}^{k} g'_j = \prod_{i=r+1}^{r+k} g_i$ and for $k \in [1, r+s]$, we define $G_k = \prod_{i=1}^{k} g_i$. If $k \in [1,s]$, then $G_r G'_k = G_{r+k}$. Let $G_0 = G'_0 = 1$.

Let $\mathcal{C}'$ be the additive system $\mathcal{C} = (C_k)_{k\in K}$ dilated by $(g'_k)_{k\in[1,s]}$. We can assume that $K \cap \mathbf{N} = \emptyset$. From the definition of dilation, we have $\mathcal{C}' = (C'_k)_{k\in K'}$, where

$$K' = [1,s] \cup K$$

and

$$C'_k = \begin{cases} G'_{k-1} * [0, g'_k) & \text{if } k \in [1,s] \\ G'_s * C_k & \text{if } k \in K. \end{cases}$$

Let $\mathcal{B} = (B_j)_{j\in J}$ be a contraction of $\mathcal{C}'$, where $J \cap \mathbf{N} = \emptyset$. This means that there is a partition $(K'_j)_{j\in J}$ of K' such that $K'_j \neq \emptyset$ and

$$B_j = \bigoplus_{k\in K'_j} C'_k$$

for all $j \in J$.

Let $\mathcal{B}'$ be the additive system $\mathcal{B}$ dilated by $(g_i)_{i\in[1,r]}$. Then $\mathcal{B}' = (B'_j)_{j\in J'}$, where

$$J' = [1,r] \cup J$$

and

$$B'_j = \begin{cases} G_{j-1} * [0, g_j) & \text{if } j \in [1,r] \\ G_r * B_j & \text{if } j \in J. \end{cases}$$

Because $\mathcal{A} = (A_i)_{i\in I}$ is a contraction of $\mathcal{B}' = (B'_j)_{j\in J'}$, there is a partition $(J'_i)_{i\in I}$ of J' such that, for all $i \in I$, we have $J'_i \neq \emptyset$ and

$$\begin{aligned} A_i &= \bigoplus_{j\in J'_i} B'_j \\ &= \left(\bigoplus_{j\in J'_i\cap[1,r]} G_{j-1} * [0, g_j) \right) \oplus \left(\bigoplus_{j\in J'_i\setminus[1,r]} G_r * B_j \right) \\ &= \left(\bigoplus_{j\in J'_i\cap[1,r]} G_{j-1} * [0, g_j) \right) \oplus \left(\bigoplus_{j\in J'_i\setminus[1,r]} \bigoplus_{k\in K'_j} G_r * C'_k \right). \end{aligned}$$

Note that $J'_i \setminus [1,r] \subseteq J$. For $j \in J'_i \setminus [1,r]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \bigoplus_{k\in K'_j} G_r * C'_k &= \left(\bigoplus_{k\in K'_j\cap[1,s]} G_r * G'_{k-1} * [0, g'_k) \right) \oplus \left(\bigoplus_{k\in K'_j\setminus[1,s]} G_r * G'_s * C_k \right) \\ &= \left(\bigoplus_{k\in K'_j\cap[1,s]} G_{r+k-1} * [0, g_{r+k}) \right) \oplus \left(\bigoplus_{k\in K'_j\setminus[1,s]} G_{r+s} * C_k \right). \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$A_i = \left(\bigoplus_{j \in J'_i \cap [1,r]} G_{j-1} * [0, g_j) \right) \oplus \left(\bigoplus_{j \in J'_i \setminus [1,r]} \bigoplus_{k \in K'_j \cap [1,s]} G_{r+k-1} * [0, g_{r+k}) \right)$$
$$\oplus \left(\bigoplus_{j \in J'_i \setminus [1,r]} \bigoplus_{k \in K'_j \setminus [1,s]} G_{r+s} * C_k \right).$$

This is a decomposition of A_i into a sum of sets. We call these sets the *summands* of A_i. The summands of A_i are pairwise distinct sets.

We must prove that $\mathcal{A} = (A_i)_{i \in I}$ is a contraction of the additive system $\mathcal{C}$ dilated by $(g_i)_{i=1}^{r+s}$. This dilated additive system can be written in the form $\mathcal{A}^\sharp = (A^\sharp_k)_{k \in K^\sharp}$, where

$$K^\sharp = [1, r+s] \cup K$$

and

$$A^\sharp_k = \begin{cases} G_{k-1} * [0, g_k) & \text{if } k \in [1, r+s] \\ G_{r+s} * C_k & \text{if } k \in K. \end{cases}$$

Note that every summand in A_i is equal to $A^\sharp_k$ for some $k \in K^\sharp$. Thus, it suffices to show that for every $k \in K^\sharp$ there is a unique $i \in I$ such that $A^\sharp_k$ is a summand in A_i.

The sets in the sequence $(J'_i)_{i \in I}$ partition $J' = [1,r] \cup J$. Thus, for every $j \in [1,r]$ there is a unique $i \in I$ such that $j \in J'_i \cap [1,r]$, and so there is a unique $i \in I$ such that $G_{j-1} * [0, g_j)$ is a summand in A_i.

Because the sets in the sequence $(K'_j)_{j \in J}$ partition $K' = [1,s] \cup K$, for every $k \in [1,s]$ there is a unique $j \in J$ such that $k \in K'_j \cap [1,s]$. The sets $(J'_i \setminus [1,r])_{i \in I}$ partition J, and so there is a unique $i \in I$ such that $j \in J'_i \setminus [1,r]$. It follows that there is a unique $i \in I$ such that $G_{r+k-1} * [0, g_{r+k})$ is a summand in A_i.

Let $k \in K$. There is a unique $j \in J$ such that $k \in K'_j \setminus [1,s]$, and there is a unique $i \in I$ such that $j \in J'_i \setminus [1,r]$. It follows that there is a unique $i \in I$ such that $G_{r+s} * C_k$ is a summand in A_i. This proves that $\mathcal{A}$ is a contraction of the additive system $\mathcal{A}^\sharp$.

Indeed, defining

$$K^\sharp_i = (J'_i \cap [1,r]) \cup \left(\bigcup_{j \in J'_i \setminus [1,r]} \left(r + (K'_j \cap [1,s]) \right) \right) \cup \left(\bigcup_{j \in J'_i \setminus [1,r]} K'_j \setminus [1,s] \right)$$

we obtain a partition $\left(K^\sharp_i\right)_{i \in [1,r+s] \cup I}$ of K such that

$$A_i = \bigoplus_{k \in K^\sharp_i} A^\sharp_k$$

for all $i \in I$. This completes the proof. □

Lemma 6. *Let $(\mathcal{A}_i)_{i \in [0,n]}$ be a sequence of additive systems and let $(g_i)_{i \in [1,n]}$ be a sequence of integers $g_i \geq 2$ such that $\mathcal{A}_{i-1}$ is a contraction of $\mathcal{A}_i$ dilated by g_i for all $i \in [1,n]$. Then $\mathcal{A}_0$ is a contraction of $\mathcal{A}_n$ dilated by the sequence $(g_i)_{i \in [1,n]}$.*

Proof. This follows from Lemma 5 by induction on n. □

Theorem 5. *Every additive system is a British number system or a proper contraction of a British number system.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{A} = (A_i)_{i \in I}$ be an additive system, where, as usual, we assume that $I \cap \mathbf{N} = \emptyset$. If $|I| = 1$, then the additive system $\mathcal{A}$ consists of the single set $\mathbf{N}_0$, and $\mathbf{N}_0$ is a proper contraction of every British number system.

Let $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_0$. If $|I| \geq 2$, then Lemma 4 produces an additive system $\mathcal{A}_1 = (A_{i,1})_{i \in I_1}$, with $I_1 \subseteq I$, and an integer $g_1 \geq 2$, such that $\mathcal{A}_0$ is a contraction of $\mathcal{A}_1$ dilated by g_1.

Let $r \geq 1$, and suppose that we have constructed a sequence $(g_i)_{i \in [1,r]}$ of integers $g_i \geq 2$ and a sequence of additive systems $(\mathcal{A}_i)_{i \in [0,r]}$ such that $\mathcal{A}_{i-1}$ is a contraction of $\mathcal{A}_i$ dilated by g_i for all $i \in [1,r]$. If $\mathcal{A}_r = (A_{i,r})_{i \in I_r}$ and $|I_r| \geq 2$, then there is an additive system $\mathcal{A}_{r+1} = (A_{i,1})_{i \in I_{r+1}}$, with $I_{r+1} \subseteq I_r \subseteq I$, and an integer $g_{r+1} \geq 2$ such that $\mathcal{A}_r$ is a contraction of $\mathcal{A}_{r+1}$ dilated by g_{r+1}.

There are two cases. In the first case, the process of constructing $\mathcal{A}_{r+1}$ from $\mathcal{A}_r$ terminates after n steps. This means that, after constructing the finite sequence of additive systems $(\mathcal{A}_i)_{i \in [0,n]}$, we obtain $\mathcal{A}_n = (A_{i,n})_{i \in I_n}$ with $|I_n| = 1$, that is, $\mathcal{A}_n$ is the additive system consisting only of the set $\mathbf{N}_0$. By Lemma 6, $\mathcal{A}$ is a contraction of $(\mathbf{N}_0)$ by the sequence $(g_i)_{i \in [1,n]}$. Because $(\mathbf{N}_0)$ contraction of every British number system, it follows that $\mathcal{A}$ is also a contraction of every British number system.

In the second case, the process of constructing $\mathcal{A}_{r+1}$ from $\mathcal{A}_r$ never terminates, and we obtain an infinite sequence $(\mathcal{A}_i)_{i \in \mathbf{N}}$ of additive systems and an infinite sequence $(g_i)_{i \in \mathbf{N}}$ of integers $g_i \geq 2$ such that $\mathcal{A}_i$ is a contraction of the dilation of $\mathcal{A}_{i+1}$ by g_i for all $i \in \mathbf{N}$. By Lemma 6, we know that, for every positive integer n, the additive system $\mathcal{A}$ is a contraction of $\mathcal{A}_n$ dilated by the sequence $(g_i)_{i \in [1,n]}$.

Recall that the additive system $\mathcal{A}_n = (A_{i,n})_{i \in I_n}$ dilated by the sequence $(g_i)_{i \in [1,n]}$ consists of the sets $G_{i-1} * [0, g_i)$ for $i \in [1,n]$ and $G_n * A_{i,n}$ for $i \in I$.

Let $\mathcal{A}^\flat$ be the British number system generated by the infinite sequence $(g_i)_{i \in \mathbf{N}}$. We must prove that $\mathcal{A}$ is a contraction of $\mathcal{A}^\flat$. Equivalently, we must construct a partition $(L_i)_{i \in I}$ of $\mathbf{N}$ into pairwise disjoint nonempty sets such that

$$A_i = \sum_{n \in L_i} G_{n-1} * [0, g_n) \tag{3}$$

for all $i \in I$.

Let

$$L_i = \{ n \in \mathbf{N} : G_{n-1} \in A_i \}$$

and

$$I^\flat = \{ i \in I : L_i \neq \emptyset \}.$$

Let $n \in \mathbf{N}$. The additive system $\mathcal{A}$ is a contraction of the additive system $\mathcal{A}_n$, and $G_{n-1} * [0, g_n)$ is a set in $\mathcal{A}_n$. Therefore, the set $G_{n-1} * [0, g_n)$ is a summand in some set A_i in $\mathcal{A}$. Because

$$G_{n-1} \in G_{n-1} * [0, g_n) \subseteq A_i$$

it follows that $n \in L_i$ and so $\mathbf{N} = \bigcup_{i \in I^\flat} L_i$. Because the sets $(A_i)_{i \in I}$ are pairwise disjoint, it follows that there is a unique $i \in I^\flat$ such that $G_{n-1} \in A_i$ and $n \in L_i$, and so $(L_i)_{i \in I^\flat}$ is a partition of $\mathbf{N}$ into nonempty, pairwise disjoint sets.

Let $i \in I$ and $x \in A_i \setminus \{0\}$. Then $1 \leq x < G_N$ for some $N \in \mathbf{N}$. Because $\mathcal{A}$ is a contraction of $\mathcal{A}_N$, the set A_i is a sum of sets of the form $G_{n-1} * [0, g_n)$ with $n \in [1, N]$ and sets all of whose positive elements are greater than or equal to G_N.

It follows that there is a nonempty subset J of $[1, N]$ such that $x = \sum_{n \in J} G_{n-1}x_n$, with $x_n \in [0, g_n)$ and $G_{n-1}x_n \in A_i$ for all $n \in J$. This is possible only if $G_{n-1} \in G_{n-1} * [0, g_n) \subseteq A_i$ for all $n \in J$, and so $J \subseteq L_i$ and $x \in \sum_{n \in L_i} G_{n-1} * [0, g_n)$, that is,

$$A_i \subseteq \sum_{n \in L_i} G_{n-1} * [0, g_n). \tag{4}$$

Moreover, $L_i \neq \emptyset$ implies that $i \in I^\flat$ and so $I^\flat = I$.

Conversely, if $i \in I$ and $n \in L_i$, then $G_{n-1} * [0, g_n) \subseteq A_i$ and so

$$\sum_{n \in L_i} G_{n-1} * [0, g_n) \subseteq A_i. \tag{5}$$

The set inclusions (4) and (5) imply (3). This proves that $\mathcal{A}$ is a contraction of the British number system $\mathcal{A}^\flat$. □

6. Indecomposable additive systems

An *indecomposable additive system* is an additive system $\mathcal{A} = (A_i)_{i \in I}$ in which every set A_i is indecomposable. Equivalently, an indecomposable additive system is an additive system that is not a proper contraction of another additive system. By Theorem 5, every additive system is a British number system or a proper contraction of a British number system. However, a British number system can also be a proper contraction of another British number system. Consider, for example, the British number systems $\mathcal{A}_2$ and $\mathcal{A}_4$ generated by the sequences $(2)_{i \in \mathbf{N}}$ and $(4)_{i \in \mathbf{N}}$, respectively:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_2 &= (\{0, 2^{i-1}\})_{i \in \mathbf{N}} = (2^{i-1} * [0, 2))_{i \in \mathbf{N}} \\ \mathcal{A}_4 &= (\{0, 4^{i-1}, 2 \cdot 4^{i-1}, 3 \cdot 4^{i-1}\})_{i \in \mathbf{N}} = (4^{i-1} * [0, 4))_{i \in \mathbf{N}}. \end{aligned}$$

Because

$$4^{i-1} * [0, 4) = \{0, 2^{2i-2}\} + \{0, 2^{2i-1}\} = 2^{2i-2} * [0, 2) + 2^{2i-1} * [0, 2)$$

we see that $\mathcal{A}_4$ is a contraction of $\mathcal{A}_2$.

De Bruijn [4] asserted the following necessary and sufficient condition for one British number system to be a contraction of another British number system.

Theorem 6. *Let $\mathcal{A} = (A_i)_{i \in \mathbf{N}}$ be a British number system, and let $\mathcal{B} = (B_j)_{j \in J}$ be the contraction of $\mathcal{A}$ constructed from the partition $(I_j)_{j \in J}$ of $\mathbf{N}$. Then $\mathcal{B}$ is a British number system if and only if I_j is a finite interval of integers for all $j \in J$.*

Proof. Let $(I_j)_{j \in J}$ be a partition of $\mathbf{N}$ into nonempty, pairwise disjoint sets. Then I_j is a finite interval for all $j \in J$ if and only if, after re-indexing, $J = \mathbf{N}$ and there is a strictly increasing sequence $(u_j)_{j \in \mathbf{N}_0}$ of nonnegative integers with $u_0 = 0$ such that $I_j = [u_{j-1} + 1, u_j]$ for all $j \in \mathbf{N}$.

Let $\mathcal{A} = (A_i)_{i \in \mathbf{N}}$ be the British number system generated by the sequence $(g_i)_{i \in \mathbf{N}}$, and let $G_0 = 1$ and $G_k = \prod_{i=1}^k g_i$ for $k \in \mathbf{N}$. Recall that $A_i = G_{i-1} * [0, g_i)$ for all $i \in \mathbf{N}$ and

$$[0, G_u) = \bigoplus_{i \in [1,u]} G_{i-1} * [0, g_i) \tag{6}$$

for all $u \in \mathbf{N}$. Let $\mathcal{B} = (B_j)_{j \in J}$ be the contraction of $\mathcal{A}$ constructed from a partition $(I_j)_{j \in \mathbf{N}}$ of $\mathbf{N}$ such that each set I_j is a nonempty, finite interval of integers. Let

$(u_j)_{j\in\mathbf{N}_0}$ be the strictly increasing sequence such that $I_j = [u_{j-1+1}, u_j]$ for all $j \in \mathbf{N}$. Consider the integer sequence $(h_j)_{j\in\mathbf{N}}$ defined by

$$h_j = \prod_{i=u_{j-1}+1}^{u_j} g_i$$

for all $j \in \mathbf{N}$. Let $H_0 = 1$ and

$$H_\ell = \prod_{j=1}^{\ell} h_j = \prod_{j=1}^{\ell} \prod_{i=u_{j-1}+1}^{u_j} g_i = \prod_{j=1}^{u_\ell} g_i = G_{u_\ell}.$$

Applying (6), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
[0, H_{j-1}h_j) = [0, H_j) = [0, G_{u_j}) &= \bigoplus_{i\in[1,u_j]} G_{i-1} * [0, g_i) \\
&= \bigoplus_{i\in[1,u_{j-1}]} G_{i-1} * [0, g_i) \oplus \bigoplus_{i\in[u_{j-1}+1,u_j]} G_{i-1} * [0, g_i) \\
&= [0, G_{u_{j-1}}) \oplus \bigoplus_{i\in I_j} G_{i-1} * [0, g_i) \\
&= [0, H_{j-1}) \oplus \bigoplus_{i\in I_j} G_{i-1} * [0, g_i)
\end{aligned}$$

Applying Corollary 2 with $a = H_{j-1}$ and $b = h_j$, we obtain

$$\bigoplus_{i\in I_j} G_{i-1} * [0, g_i) = H_{j-1} * [0, h_j)$$

and so

$$B_j = \sum_{i\in I_j} A_i = \sum_{i\in I_j} G_{i-1} * [0, g_i) = H_{j-1} * [0, h_j).$$

Thus, $\mathcal{B} = (B_j)_{j\in\mathbf{N}}$ is the British number system generated by the sequence $(h_j)_{j\in\mathbf{N}}$.

Conversely, let $\mathcal{B} = (B_j)_{j\in J}$ be a contraction of $\mathcal{A}$ constructed from a partition $(I_j)_{j\in\mathbf{N}}$ of $\mathbf{N}$ in which some set I_{j_0} is a not a finite interval of integers. Let $u = \min(I_{j_0})$ and $w = \max(I_{j_0})$. Because I_{j_0} is not an interval, there is a smallest integer v such that $u < v < w$ and $[u, v-1] \subseteq I_{j_0}$, but $v \notin I_{j_0}$. Then

$$I_{j_0} \subseteq [u, v-1] \cup [v+1, w]$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
B_{j_0} &= \sum_{i\in I_{j_0}} G_{i-1} * [0, g_i) \\
&\subseteq \sum_{i\in[u,v-1]} G_{i-1} * [0, g_i) + \sum_{i\in[v+1,w]} G_{i-1} * [0, g_i) \\
&\subseteq [0, G_{v-1}) + G_v * \mathbf{N}_0
\end{aligned}$$

The smallest positive integer in B_{j_0} is G_{u-1}, the largest positive integer B_{j_0} is

$$G_{w-1}(g_w - 1) = G_{u-1}\left(\frac{G_{w-1}}{G_{u-1}}\right)(g_w - 1)$$

and every integer in B_{j_0} is a multiple of G_{u-1}. However,

$$G_{v-1} = G_{u-1}\left(\frac{G_{v-1}}{G_{u-1}}\right) \notin B_{j_0}$$

and

$$1 < \frac{G_{v-1}}{G_{u-1}} < \frac{G_{w-1}}{G_{u-1}} \leq \left(\frac{G_{w-1}}{G_{u-1}}\right)(g_w - 1).$$

In a British number system, every set is of the form $H * [0, h)$, and so consists of consecutive multiples of its smallest positive element. Because the set B_{j_0} lacks this property, it follows that $\mathcal{B}$ is not a British number system. This completes the proof. □

Theorem 7. *There is a one-to-one correspondence between sequences* $(p_i)_{i\in\mathbf{N}}$ *of prime numbers and indecomposable British number systems. Moreover, every additive system is either indecomposable or a contraction of an indecomposable system.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a British number system generated by the sequence $(g_i)_{i\in\mathbf{N}}$, so that

$$\mathcal{A} = \left(G_{i-1} * [0, g_i)\right)_{i\in\mathbf{N}}.$$

Suppose that g_k is composite for some $k \in \mathbf{N}$. Then $g_k = rs$, where $r \geq 2$ and $s \geq 2$ are integers. Construct the sequence $(g'_i)_{i\in\mathbf{N}}$ as follows:

$$g'_i = \begin{cases} g_i & \text{if } i \leq k-1 \\ r & \text{if } i = k \\ s & \text{if } i = k+1 \\ g_{i-1} & \text{if } i \geq k+2. \end{cases}$$

Then

$$G'_i = \prod_{j=1}^{i} g'_j = \begin{cases} G_i & \text{if } i \leq k-1 \\ rG_{k-1} & \text{if } i = k \\ G_k & \text{if } i = k+1 \\ G_{i-1} & \text{if } i \geq k+2 \end{cases}$$

and

$$\mathcal{A}' = \left(G'_{i-1} * [0, g'_i)\right)_{i\in\mathbf{N}}$$

is the British number system generated by the sequence $(g'_i)_{i\in\mathbf{N}}$. We have

$$G_{i-1} * [0, g_i) = \begin{cases} G'_{i-1} * [0, g'_i) & \text{if } i \leq k-1 \\ G'_i * [0, g'_{i+1}) & \text{if } i \geq k+1. \end{cases}$$

The identity

$$[0, g_k) = [0, rs) = [0, r) \oplus r * [0, s) = [0, g'_k) + \frac{G'_k}{G_{k-1}} * [0, g'_{k+1})$$

implies that

$$G_{k-1} * [0, g_k) = G'_{k-1} * [0, g'_k) + G'_k * [0, g'_{k+1}) = \sum_{i\in\{k,k+1\}} G'_{i-1} * [0, g'_i).$$

This implies that the British number system $\mathcal{A}$ is a contraction of $\mathcal{A}'$.

Conversely, if $\mathcal{A}$ is a contraction of a British number system $\mathcal{A}' = \left(G'_{i-1} * [0, g'_i)\right)_{i \in \mathbf{N}}$, then there are a positive integer k and a set I_k of positive integers with $|I_k| \geq 2$ such that

$$G_{k-1} * [0, g_k) = \sum_{i \in I_k} G'_{i-1} * [0, g'_i).$$

Therefore,

$$g_k = |G_{k-1} * [0, g_k)| = \left| \sum_{i \in I_k} G'_{i-1} * [0, g'_i) \right| = \prod_{i \in I_k} g'_i.$$

Because $|I_k| \geq 2$ and $|g'_i| \geq 2$ for all $i \in \mathbf{N}$, it follows that the integer g_k is composite. Thus, the British number system generated by $(g_i)_{i \in \mathbf{N}}$ is decomposable if and only if g_i is composite for at least one $i \in \mathbf{N}$. Equivalently, the British number system generated by $(g_i)_{i \in \mathbf{N}}$ is composable if and only if g_i is prime for all $i \in \mathbf{N}$. This completes the proof. □

7. Limits of additive systems

Let $(\mathcal{A}_n)_{n \in N}$ be a sequence of additive systems. The additive system $\mathcal{A}$ is the *limit* of the sequence $(\mathcal{A}_n)_{n \in N}$ if it satisfies the following condition: The set S belongs to $\mathcal{A}$ if and only if S belongs to $\mathcal{A}_n$ for all sufficiently large n. We write

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \mathcal{A}_n = \mathcal{A}$$

if $\mathcal{A}$ is the limit of the sequence $(\mathcal{A}_n)_{n \in N}$. The following result indicates the remarkable stability of a British number system.

Theorem 8. *Let $(g_i)_{i \in \mathbf{N}}$ be a sequence of integers such that $g_i \geq 2$ for all $i \in \mathbf{N}$, and let $\mathcal{G}$ be the British number system generated by $(g_i)_{i \in \mathbf{N}}$. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be an additive system and let $\mathcal{A}_n = (g_i)_{i \in [1,n]} * \mathcal{A}$. Then*

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \mathcal{A}_n = \mathcal{G}.$$

Proof. If S is a set in $\mathcal{G}$, then $S = G_{r-1} * [0, g_r)$ for some $r \in \mathbf{N}$. By the dilation construction, the S is a set in $\mathcal{A}_n$ for all $n \geq r$, and so $S \in \lim_{n \to \infty} \mathcal{A}_n$.

Conversely, if $S \in \lim_{n \to \infty} \mathcal{A}_n$, then S is a set in $\mathcal{A}_n$ for all sufficiently large n. If S is finite, then $\max(S) < G_N$ for some integer N. If $n \geq N$ and if A is a finite set in $\mathcal{A}_n$, then $A = G_{r-1} * [0, g_r)$ for some $r \leq n$ or $\sup(A) \geq G_n \geq G_N$. Thus, if S is a finite set in $\mathcal{A}_n$ for all sufficiently large n, then $S = G_{r-1} * [0, g_r)$ for some $r \in [1, N)$, and so S is in $\mathcal{G}$. If S is an infinite set in $\mathcal{A}_n$, then $\min(S \setminus \{0\}) \geq G_n$ and so no infinite set belongs to $\mathcal{A}_n$ for infinitely many n. This completes the proof. □

Corollary 3. *Let $(g_i)_{i \in \mathbf{N}}$ be a sequence of integers such that $g_i \geq 2$ for all $i \in \mathbf{N}$, and let $\mathcal{G}$ be the British number system generated by $(g_i)_{i \in \mathbf{N}}$. If $\mathcal{G}_n = (g_i)_{i \in [1,n]} * \mathbf{N}_0$, then*

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \mathcal{G}_n = \mathcal{G}.$$

8. Remarks and open problems

Remark 1: Let X be a nonempty set. The *free monoid* on X is the set $\mathcal{M}(X)$ consisting of all finite sequences of elements of X, and also an element e (the "empty sequence"), with the binary operation of *concatenation.* We define the product of the nonempty sequences $(g_i)_{i \in [1,r]}$ and $(g'_j)_{j \in [1,s]}$ as follows:

$$(g_i)_{i \in [1,r]} * (g'_j)_{j \in [1,s]} = (g''_k)_{k \in [1,r+s]}$$

where

$$g''_k = \begin{cases} g_k & \text{if } k \in [1,r] \\ g'_{k-r} & \text{if } k \in [r+1, r+s] \end{cases}$$

and we define $e * e = e$ and

$$(g_i)_{i\in[1,r]} * e = (g_i)_{i\in[1,r]} * e = (g_i)_{i\in[1,r]}.$$

The isomorphism class of the free monoid $\mathcal{M}(X)$ depends only on the cardinality of X. Lemma 1 states that the free monoid on the set $\mathbf{N} \setminus \{1\}$ acts by dilation on the set of additive systems.

Remark 2: Additive systems for the nonnegative integers are part of the general study of sumsets. If A and B are sets of integers, then their sumset is the set $A + B = \{a + b : a \in A \text{ and } b \in B\}$. It is, in general, difficult to determine if a set of integers is a sumset of "almost" a sumset, or to determine if a set is decomposable. Here are some open problems: Let C be a nonempty finite or infinite set of integers.

1. Do there exist sets A and B with $|A| \geq 2$, $|B| \geq 2$, and $A \oplus B = C$?
2. Do there exist sets A and B with $|A| \geq 2$, $|B| \geq 2$, and $A + B = C$?
3. Do there exist sets A and B with $|A| \geq 2$ and $|B| \geq 2$ such that $A + B \subseteq C$ and $C \setminus (A + B)$ is "small"?
4. Do there exist sets A and B with $|A| \geq 2$ and $|B| \geq 2$ such that $A + B \supseteq C$ and $(A + B) \setminus C$ is "small"?
5. Does there exist a set A with $|A| \geq 2$ and $A + A = C$?
6. Does there exist a set A with $|A| \geq 2$ such that $A + A \subseteq C$ and $C \setminus (A + A)$ is "small"?
7. Does there exist a set A with $|A| \geq 2$ such that $A + A \supseteq C$ and $(A + A) \setminus C$ is "small"?

There problems are related to Freiman's theorem and other inverse problems in additive number theory (cf. Nathanson [10] and Tao and Vu [16]).

Remark 3: It is natural to investigate additive systems for the additive group $\mathbf{Z}$ of integers, that is, sequences $(A_i)_{i\in I}$ of sets of integers such that $0 \in A_i$ and $|A_i| \geq 2$ for all $i \in I$, and

$$\mathbf{Z} = \bigoplus_{i \in I} A_i.$$

For example, if $a_i = \varepsilon_i 2^{i-1}$ with $\varepsilon_i \in \{1, -1\}$ for all $i \in \mathbf{N}$, then $(\{0, a_i\})_{i\in\mathbf{N}}$ is an additive system for $\mathbf{Z}$ if and only if $\varepsilon_i = 1$ for infinitely many i and $\varepsilon_i = -1$ for infinitely many i. The classification problem for additive systems for the integers is unsolved. Even the special case $A_i = \{0, a_i\}$ for all i is difficult. de Bruijn [3] proved the following conjecture of T. Szele: If $(a_i)_{i\in\mathbf{N}}$ is an infinite sequence of nonzero integers such that $(\{0, a_i\})_{i\in\mathbf{N}}$ is an additive system for $\mathbf{Z}$, then there is a sequence $(d_i)_{i\in\mathbf{N}}$ of odd integers such that, after rearrangement, $a_i = 2^{i-1} d_i$ for all $i \in \mathbf{N}$.

There are many interesting recent results about additive systems for $\mathbf{Z}$, for example, [1, 5, 6, 7, 9, 15, 17]. However, de Bruijn's remark at the end of his 1956 paper on $\mathbf{N}_0$ still accurately describes the current state of the problem: "Some years ago the author [3] discussed various aspects of the analogous problem for number systems representing uniquely all integers (without restriction to nonnegative ones). That problem is much more difficult than the one dealt with above [additive systems for $\mathbf{N}_0$], and it is still far from a complete solution."

Remark 4: The interval identity $[0, mn) = [0, m) + m * [0, n-1)$, basic to the problem of additive systems for $\mathbf{N}_0$, also led to the study of multiplication rules for quantum integers (cf. [2, 8, 11, 12, 13]).

Remark 5: De Bruijn's paper [4] fills less than three pages. After proving Lemma 4, he writes, "[Theorem 5] easily follows by repeated application of the …lemma." R. A. Rankin [14] repeated this in his report on de Bruijn's paper in *Mathematical Reviews*: "[Theorem 5] follows from repeated applications of [the] lemma…." Mathematicians, from the humblest graduate student to the grandest Fields medalist, often don't bother to write out justifications for statements that are "obvious" or that "easily follow" from previously proved results. But what is obvious to an author is not necessarily obvious to a reader (and sometimes an "obvious truth" is false). The reader may decide how "easily" de Bruijn's theorem follows from Lemma 4. I prefer to err on the side of too much proof and not to overuse the virtue of brevity.

References

[1] A. Biró, *Divisibility of integer polynomials and tilings of the integers*, Acta Arith. **118** (2005), no. 2, 117–127.

[2] A. Borisov, M. B. Nathanson, and Y. Wang, *Quantum integers and cyclotomy*, J. Number Theory **109** (2004), no. 1, 120–135.

[3] N. G. de Bruijn, *On bases for the set of integers*, Publ. Math. Debrecen **1** (1950), 232–242.

[4] ______, *On number systems*, Nieuw Arch. Wisk. (3) **4** (1956), 15–17.

[5] ______, *Some direct decompositions of the set of integers*, Math. Comp. **18** (1964), 537–546.

[6] S. Eigen and A. Hajian, *Hereditary tiling sets of the integers*, Integers **8** (2008), A54, 9.

[7] S. J. Eigen, Y. Ito, and V. S. Prasad, *Universally bad integers and the 2-adics*, J. Number Theory **107** (2004), no. 2, 322–334.

[8] A. V. Kontorovich and M. B. Nathanson, *Quadratic addition rules for quantum integers*, J. Number Theory **117** (2006), no. 1, 1–13.

[9] Ž. Ljujić, *Periodicity of complementing multisets*, Funct. Approx. Comment. Math. **46** (2012), no. part 2, 161–175.

[10] M. B. Nathanson, *Additive Number Theory: Inverse Problems and the Geometry of Sumsets*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1996.

[11] ______, *A functional equation arising from multiplication of quantum integers*, J. Number Theory **103** (2003), no. 2, 214–233.

[12] ______, *Semidirect products and functional equations for quantum multiplication*, J. Algebra Appl. **10** (2011), no. 5, 827–834.

[13] L. Nguyen, *On the solutions of a functional equation arising from multiplication of quantum integers*, J. Number Theory **130** (2010), no. 6, 1292–1347.

[14] R. A. Rankin, Review of [4], (MathSciNet identifier: MR0077556 (17,1056d)), *Mathematical Reviews*, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence.

[15] W. M. Schmidt and D. M. Tuller, *Covering and packing in $\mathbb{Z}^n$ and $\mathbb{R}^n$. I*, Monatsh. Math. **153** (2008), no. 3, 265–281.

[16] T.Tao and V. Vu, *Additive Combinatorics*, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2006.

[17] R. Tijdeman, *Decomposition of the integers as a direct sum of two subsets*, Number Theory (Paris, 1992–1993), London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser., vol. 215, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1995, pp. 261–276.

Lehman College (CUNY),Bronx, New York 10468
E-mail address: `melvyn.nathanson@lehman.cuny.edu`